



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,972	01/10/2001	Sandeep Jaggi	30454-00275	9634
24319	7590	11/02/2005	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			VAN DOREN, BETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/758,972	JAGGI, SANDEEP	
	Examiner Beth Van Doren	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Prosecution has been re-opened in response to the Appeal Brief filed on 08/11/2005.

Accordingly, the following is a Non-Final Office Action. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: misspelled word. Claim 20 recites “the system of claim 15, herein (i)”, which should more appropriately be --the system of claim 15, wherein (i)--. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant’s arguments with regards to Grow (U.S. 6,694,315) have been fully considered.

4. Applicant’s argument that (1) Grow does not teach or suggest that a warning is a reminder to complete a task has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 8, 13-14, 18-19 have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of Grow. See rejections that follow.

5. Applicant’s other arguments with respect to Grow have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that Grow does not teach or suggest (2) that an administrator is one of a plurality of individuals associated with a project or a task, that the administrator ensures that a deadline is met, and that the administrator is a user, (3) providing a second reminder to a second individual associated with a project after a predetermined number of first reminders have been transmitted to the first individual, where the second individual does not receive the first reminder, (4) transmitting, responsive to completion of a first task, an instruction

to complete a second task to a first individual of a plurality of individuals associated with a project, wherein the reminder to complete the second task is linked to the completion of the first task (claim 12), (5) Grow does not teach or suggest transmitting a first reminder before a date using one mode and transmitting a second reminder on the date using a different mode because Grow fails to mention the sequence of modes (claims 15 and 20), (6) a plurality of individuals in a first database, a completion of a first task in a second database, and data concerning the project in a third database (claim 17), (7) means for generating in a second database a second date that is before a deadline but after a first date or means for generating and electronically transmitting to the first individual on the second date a second reminder to complete the task and that (8) there is no motivation or evidence provided as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would consider sending reminders at an increased rate as a deadline approaches to reduce a potential to miss a deadline.

In response to argument (2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Applicant's argues that the administrator is not one of a plurality of individuals associated with a project or a task, stating on page 16 of the appeal brief that the payment agreement between the user and the administrator conflicts with the idea that both are associated with the same project or law firm. Examiner points out that the claims do state that a plurality of individuals are associated with a project, but the claims do not specifically recite how these individuals are connected with the project (i.e. the individuals are not given any specific roles or functions in the claims, just merely that they are somehow linked to the project and receive reminders). Grow discloses that an administrative, second user is known in the system and receives a second, subsequent reminder (or prompt) when another user in the system does not respond to a first reminder he/she receives.

See column 18, lines 10-35, of Grow which discuss a second reminder being sent to a first user and a second user (an administrator) in order to reduce the potential of a missed deadline.

Nothing in the claim language bars the second user from being an administrator. As to Applicant's second argument regarding the administrator, the administrator of Grow does ensure that a deadline is met for the task by monitoring which users are and are not responding to their reminders to complete tasks by the assigned deadlines. Finally, as to Applicant's third argument, the administrator of Grow is a user of the system (i.e. a person with an identity known to the system). See column 3, lines 25-45, which discuss the administrator as a user of the host computer. Examiner points out that the claims do restrict the first and the second user from having different roles associated with the project and system as, again, the claims do not specifically recite how these individuals are connected with the project.

In response to argument (3), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner first points out that the claim does not specifically state how many reminders "a predetermined number of reminders" and therefore, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, any number of reminders, such as one, two, fifteen, etc., would satisfy this limitation. Examiner further points out that the system knows at what point it must send the communication to the administrator. Therefore, since the system acts automatically, the time at which the communication is sent must be predetermined. Therefore, see at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder being sent to an administrator when a failed reminder occurs with the first user.

In response to argument (4), Examiner respectfully disagrees. The system of Grow has set timelines associated with legal cases. As communications are sent out and received, the system updates and sets timeframes for the next action in the case (i.e. project). Therefore, the

time period for the second task and, thus, when the reminder must be sent is linked to the completion of the first task. See column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, column 18, lines 48-55 and 60-67.

In response to argument (5), Examiner respectfully disagrees. See specifically column 18, lines 10-20, wherein a first reminder is transmitted before a date (i.e. email) using one mode and transmitting a second reminder on the date using a different mode (i.e. voice message/telephone means).

In response to argument (6), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Grow teaches storing user information in a user table, completion data in a case table, and information concerning the project (such as templates used) in a third database. See figures 2(a)-(c), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, which discuss storage arrangements of the invention of Grow.

In response to argument (7), Examiner respectfully disagrees. See column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a second date is determined. For example, a first date is set in the system, with a second reminder set at a predetermined interval after the first date. In another example, a reminder is sent in advance of the critical date with a second reminder sent on the critical date. Therefore, a second date is determined and stored in the system that is before said deadline but after said first date. See column 4, lines 10-52, column 5, line 60-column 6, line 17, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a second date is determined.

In response to argument (8) that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Grow teaches sending reminders in a continuous manner to individuals and administrators in an effort to reduce the number of missed deadlines, see column 18, lines 5-30. Therefore, sending reminders at a rate, such as an incremental rate, would reduce the number of missed deadlines.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 12, 15-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grow (U.S. 6,694,315).

As per claim 12, Grow teaches a system for managing projects comprising:

a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

b. means for associating a plurality of individuals listed in a first database with said project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project. See figure 2(a), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, which discloses a user table stored in a first memory table);

c. means for inputting a completion of a first task associated with said project in a second database (See column 8, lines 50-65, column 9, lines 15-30 and 45-67, column 11, lines 15-29, column 14, lines 35-65, wherein the completion of the first task (document in the legal proceedings) is inputted and the dates updated);

d. means for generating and electronically transmitting, responsive to the completion of said first task, an instruction to complete a second task to a first individual of said individuals (See figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a reminder is electronically generated and sent for completion of a second task based on the indication of the critical date at completion of the first task).

As per claim 15, Grow teaches a system, comprising:

- a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, which disclose inputting data concerning a project);
- b. means for associating a plurality of individuals with said project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project);
- c. means for determining a date (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, wherein a date is determined);
- d. means for automatically generating and electronically transmitting by a first mode to a first individual of said individuals, prior to said date, a first reminder to complete a task associated with the project (See at least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a first reminder is sent); and

e. means for automatically generating and electronically transmitting by a second mode to said first individual a second reminder to complete the task associated with the project on said date (See at least column 18, lines 10-25 and 55-67, wherein a second reminder is sent).

As per claim 16, Grow teaches a system wherein said first mode is e-mail and said second mode is voice mail (See column 17, lines 10-25, and column 18, lines 10-20, wherein the modes of reminders are disclosed).

As per claim 17, Grow teaches wherein said data concerning said project is stored in a third database (See at least figures 2(a)-(c), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, wherein the third table can be stored in a separate, third memory).

As per claim 20, Grow teaches wherein (i) said individuals are listed in a first database and (ii) said data concerning said project is stored in a second database (See at least figures 2(a)-(c), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, wherein individuals are listed in a first table stored in a memory location and project data is stored in a second table in a separate memory location).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-11, 13-14, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grow (U.S. 6,694,315).

As per claim 1, Grow teaches a system for managing projects comprising:

- a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, which disclose inputting data concerning a project);
- b. means for associating a plurality of individuals listed in a first database with said project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project. See figure 2(a), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, which discloses a user table stored in a first memory table);
- c. means for determining a deadline for completing a task associated with said project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, wherein a date is predetermined);
- d. means for generating in a second database a first date prior to said deadline (See at least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, where a first date prior to the deadline is set. Figure 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 10-52, column 5, lines 60-67, and column 6, lines 1-17, discuss a case table is stored in a second, separate, memory table);
- e. means for generating and electronically transmitting on said first date a first reminder to complete said task to a first individual of said individuals (See at least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a first reminder is sent);
- f. means for generating in a second database a second date that is before said deadline but after said first date (See at least column 18, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a second date is determined. Figure 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 10-52, column 5, lines 60-67, and column 6, lines 1-17, discuss a second, separate, memory table);

g. means for generating and electronically transmitting to said first individual on said second date a second reminder to complete said task (See at least column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a second reminder is sent);

h. means for generating in said second database a third date that is before said deadline but after said second date (See at least column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a third reminder date is determined. Figure 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 10-52, column 5, lines 60-67, and column 6, lines 1-17, discuss a second, separate, memory table); and

i. means for generating and electronically transmitting to said first individual on said third date a third reminder to complete said task (See at least column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a third reminder is sent).

However, while Grow discloses sending a first and then multiple subsequent reminders, Grow does not expressly disclose that the number of days between said first date and said second date is greater than the number of days between said second date and said third date.

Grow discloses that a first reminder would be sent at a notification date prior to the critical date of a legal action. After this first reminder, a second reminder would be sent at a predetermined interval after the first reminder (i.e. second date). After this second date a third reminder would be sent again at a predetermined interval after the second date or a third reminder would be sent on the critical date. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the interval between the second and third date is shorter than the interval between the first and second date in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See

at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of sending multiple reminders.

As per claim 2, Grow teaches wherein said deadline is a last day to respond to an action by a governmental agency without an extension (See figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, column 11, lines 5-30 and 40-67, column 13, lines 1-10 and 35-40, wherein the deadline is based on a response to an action without an extension).

As per claim 3, Grow teaches wherein said predetermined date is the last day to respond to an action by a governmental agency without an extension (See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, and column 18, lines 20-40, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the governmental action is an office action issued by a patent examiner.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent. An office action is a well-known legal action in the patent field of law and it is further well-known that this action has a required deadline set by statutory law. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor office action deadlines in order to reduce the potential for missing deadlines to the office action by sending automatic reminders to the person

in charge of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

As per claim 4, Grow teaches a system wherein said predetermined date is a statutorily set deadline (See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the statutorily set deadline is for filing a patent application.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent. It is well known that a patent application a required deadline set by statutory law (for example, the filing of an application within a year of disclosure of the invention, the filing of a non-provisional application within a year of filing a provisional, etc.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor patent application filing deadlines in order to reduce the potential for missing filing deadlines by sending automatic reminders to the person in charge of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

As per claim 5, Grow teaches wherein said second reminder is also electronically transmitted to a second individual of said individuals who was not sent said first reminder (See at

least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, wherein a second reminder is sent to a user and an administrator).

As per claim 6, while Grow discloses sending a communication to a third individual for the purpose of reducing missed deadlines (See column 17, lines 10-25, and column 18, lines 20-30, wherein the administrator and other users are emailed), Grow does not expressly disclose that a third reminder is also electronically transmitted to a third individual of said individuals.

Grow discloses sending a first communication to a first individual, a second communication to a first individual, and a communication to a second individual in response to a second communication being sent to the first individual. Grow discloses that this communication is sent to the second individual in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines. See column 18, lines 20-30. Examiner points out that the system of Grow et al. is capable of sending a communication to a second individual when the first individual is sent a subsequent communication. The content of these communications is considered non-functional data, which neither functionally effects the capability of the claimed system or the outcome of the claim. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit to a second individual a second reminder to complete the task in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of sending multiple reminders.

As per claim 7, Grow teaches wherein said second individual is a supervisor of said first individual (See column 18, lines 20-30, wherein the second individual is the administrator of the first individual is emailed).

As per claim 8, Grow teaches a system for managing projects, comprising:

- a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, which disclose inputting data concerning a project);
- b. means for associating a plurality of individuals with said project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project);
- c. means for determining a date (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, wherein a date is predetermined);
- d. means for generating and electronically transmitting to a first individual of said individuals, prior to said date, a first reminder to complete a task associated with the project (See at least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 20-41, 48-55, and 60-67, which discloses a reminder to complete the task); and
 - means for generating and electronically transmitting to said first individual a second reminder to compete the task (See at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user);
 - means for generating and electronically transmitting to a second individual of said individuals, to whom the first reminder was not transmitted, a communication based on the second reminder being sent (See at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user).

However, Grow does not expressly disclose transmitting to a second individual a second reminder to compete the task.

Grow discloses sending a first communication to a first individual, a second communication to a first individual, and a communication to a second individual in response to a second communication being sent to the first individual. Grow discloses that this communication is sent to the second individual in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines. See column 18, lines 20-30. Examiner points out that the system of Grow et al. is capable of sending a communication to a second individual when the first individual is sent a subsequent communication. The content of these communications is considered non-functional data, which neither functionally effects the capability of the claimed system or the outcome of the claim. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit to a second individual a second reminder to complete the task in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of sending multiple reminders.

As per claim 9, Grow teaches wherein said date is the last day to respond to an action by a governmental agency without an extension (See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the governmental action is a United States Patent and Trademark Office action issued by a patent examiner.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area

of practice of an attorney or agent. An office action is a well-known legal action in the patent field of law and it is further well-known that this action has a required deadline set by statutory law. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor office action deadlines in order to reduce the potential for missing deadlines to the office action by sending automatic reminders to the person in charge of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

As per claim 10, Grow teaches wherein said date is a statutorily set deadline (See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the statutorily set deadline is for filing a patent application.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent. It is well known that a patent application a required deadline set by statutory law (for example, the filing of an application within a year of disclosure of the invention, the filing of a non-provisional application within a year of filing a provisional, etc.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor patent application filing deadlines in order to reduce the potential for missing filing deadlines by sending automatic reminders to the person in charge

of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

As per claim 11, Grow discloses a system further comprising means for generating and electronically transmitting a reminder to said first individual and a second individual, to whom the first reminder was not sent, a second reminder to compete the task (See at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user and an administrator). Grow also discloses a system wherein a law firm with multiple lawyers is identified in the system (See column 8, lines 10-40). However, Grow does not expressly disclose a third individual to whom neither the first reminder or second reminder was sent or transmitting a third reminder to the third individual.

Grow teaches a system where a reminder is sent to the individuals responsible for completing a legal action and a subsequent reminder would also be sent to an administrator associated with the individual to ensure the action is completed by the critical date. Grow further discloses storing the members of a law firm together in the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send a third reminder to a third individual in the law firm in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of sending multiple reminders.

As per claim 13, Grow teaches a system for managing projects, comprising:

- means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

b. means for associating a plurality of individuals with said project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project);

c. means for generating and electronically transmitting a plurality of first reminders to complete a task associated with said project to a first individual of said individuals (See figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein reminders are sent); and

d. means for generating and electronically transmitting a communication to a second individual of said individuals, wherein said second reminder to said second individual is generated and transmitted after a predetermined number of said first reminders have been transmitted to said first individual concerning said task (See at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user and an administrator).

However, Grow does not expressly disclose transmitting to a second individual a second reminder that said tasks require completion.

Grow discloses sending a first communication to a first individual, a second communication to a first individual, and a communication to a second individual in response to a second communication being sent to the first individual. Grow discloses that this communication is sent to the second individual in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines. See column 18, lines 20-30. Examiner points out that the system of Grow et al. is capable of sending a communication to a second individual when the first individual is sent a subsequent communication. The content of these communications is considered non-functional data, which neither functionally effects the capability of the claimed system or the outcome of the claim. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to transmit to a second individual a second reminder to compete the task in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of sending multiple reminders.

As per claim 14, Grow teaches a system wherein said second individual is a supervisor of said first individual (See at least column 18, lines 10-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user and an administrator).

As per claims 18 and 20, Grow teaches wherein (i) said individuals are listed in a first database and (i) said data concerning said project is stored in a second database (See at least figures 2(a)-(c), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, wherein individuals are list in a first table stored in a memory location and project data is stored in a second table in a separate memory location).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd

bvd
October 28, 2005



TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600